

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,510	03/17/2004	Srinka Ghosh	10030936-1	5441
7590 07/24/2006		EXAMINER		
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			FORMAN, BETTY J	
Legal Department, DL429 Intellectual Property Administration			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 7599			1634	
Loveland, CO	80537-0599		DATE MAILED: 07/24/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/803,510	GHOSH ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BJ Forman	1634	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addi	ress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (1.136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON the, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this com ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		ers, prosecution as to the r	nerits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	· •	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the applicatio	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ac	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing(	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	l 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO	-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	tage
application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		•
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies not	received.	
·			
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)	
<ul> <li>Property (PTO-948)</li> <li>Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Draftsperson Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08</li> </ul>	Paper No(s	)/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-1	52)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		~_j

Art Unit: 1634

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, drawn to a microarray and kit comprising the microarray, classified in class 435, subclass 283.1.
- II. Claims 12-21, drawn to method for evaluating a microarray, classified in class435, subclass 4.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process e.g. the microarray can be used to isolate anti-probe antibodies.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter as exemplified by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Further, a search for the inventions of both groups would not be co-extensive because a search indicating the process is novel or nonobvious would not extend to a holding that the product itself is novel or nonobvious; similarly, a search indicating that the product is known or would have been obvious would not extend to a holding that the process is known or would have been obvious.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found

Art Unit: 1634

allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of an invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Art Unit: 1634

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0741. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 TO 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571) 272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BJ Forman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1634